

Proposal Reviews

#244: Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Bay Regional Review

Delta Regional Review

External Scientific Review

#1

#2

#3

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

#1

#2

#3

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

Proposal Number: 244

Applicant Organization: USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

Proposal Title: Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	There are two primary concerns about this proposal. First it is not clear how the products of the project will relate to the professed goals of the project to provide management guidelines for conservation and restoration in the Bay-Delta region. It is especially telling that both the Bay and Delta regional panels ranked this project low. Second, it is not clear how the differing scales of the soils and ESD data will be reconciled and how the ESDs as currently constructed will be very helpful in predicting restoration success.
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

Although the linkage of vegetation dynamics and soils is of obvious use for many land management decisions, it is not clear whether the work proposed here will effectively link soils information with environmental site descriptors (ESD) in a meaningful and useful way. The applicants argue that this proposed project, focused on the Bay-Delta region, will build upon a currently funded soil mapping project. However because the focus of this currently funded project is apparently outside the Bay-Delta region, this argument seems unsupported.

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

There is a significant question as to whether the finer scale variation in ESD characteristics can be effectively linked to the broader scale soil data. Further, the rather static nature of ESDs may significantly reduce their usefulness in describing temporal variation in vegetation and thus their capacity to predict restoration success. There was general agreement, however, that the applicants have the expertise and infrastructure to complete the tasks of creating soil maps and developing ESDs for the region.

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

The primary product of this project, if successful, would be the development of a digital soil-vegetation map that would be very useful for some land managers and decision-makers. The proposed web-based format will definitely increase the accessibility of the information.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Although there was a major budget spreadsheet miscalculation (recognized by the applicants), the budget seemed adequate.

5. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

The Bay Regional panel ranked the proposal Low. The panel thought the proposal was interesting but did not think that it addresses issues of high priority for the region. The Delta Regional panel also ranked the proposal Low. The panel indicated that the information on vegetation and soils was already available for their region and that the proposal might be more valuable for other regions.

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

One of the contract managers reported that he has not been getting progress reports per contract and that this contractor is having trouble doing the work assigned. The grant manager reported that staff funded on the contract seem to be doing other tasks unrelated to the grant but rather on existing agency goals & programs. The manager further commented that this agency has a history of using grant funding to support existing programs - rather than fulfilling the terms of the grant.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 244

Applicant Organization: USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

Proposal Title: Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration

Overall Ranking: ☒Low ☐Medium ☐High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

interesting project, but would like to see the project linked to the Bay Area Eco-atlas, low priority for Bay region

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

☒Yes ☐No

How?

- no regs involved, but proposal addresses methods to get on site for access to private land

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

☒Yes ☐No

How?

- fulfills ERP goals 1,2,4,5 - fulfills Bay region goals 4 (Understand wetland restoration performance),5 (Restore shallow water, stream, + riparian habitat to benefit at-risk species)

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

☒Yes ☐No

How?

- coordinates with other agencies, most local governments and many watershed groups already aware of the existing soil survey program on which this project will build - project determined to be of low priority for Bay region

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

☒Yes ☐No

How?

- will set up advisory committee with specialists, local govt., watershed groups to provide input in the types of information to be included in the site descriptions - will be available to the public on website and a database researchers and scientists

Other Comments:

none

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 244

Proposal Title: Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration

Overall Ranking: **X**Low -Medium -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

Soils information, including information about native vegetation associated with different soil types, is already available for the region.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

soils data should already be available

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

this is more of a tool that could provide some baseline data for planning restoration of habitat corridors (DR-1), floodplains (DR-2), upland (DR-3), and other habitats (DR-4).

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

this is a mapping exercise of existing data in to a new format

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

will coordinate with landowners and local agencies

Other Comments:

probably more important in other CALFED regions

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **244**

Applicant Organization: **USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service**

Proposal Title: **Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	The development of the ecological site descriptions is not well justified in the proposal. How, specifically, would these be used? What is envisioned as the final product, and how would this advance CALFED's agenda? These things need to be stated concisely and persuasively; they are not.
-Good	
XPoor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

No: a concise case needs to be made for the value of these ecological site descriptions. This in nowhere done. Timely?: Unclear.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

No. No. Sort of a research project: would provide a research and management tool.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

Not clear. Would add knowledge. Case needs to be made. Useful: unclear.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

No. Success is not well defined in advance. Scale: unclear.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

No. No. Not appropriate.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

Not clear.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

Good. Yes. Apparently.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

There was a major mistake in the first line of the budget.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **244**

Applicant Organization: **USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service**

Proposal Title: **Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	This project would fund the development and distribution of digital soil and vegetation maps for the bay and delta regions as Ecological Site Descriptions. Digital distribution of these data is very useful for land-use planning, wildlife and rangeland management, and regional ecological modeling and restoration work and prioritizing. Because important aspects of vegetation communities, such as species and growth form composition, can vary at a spatial scale smaller than soil type units and at a relatively short temporal scale (i.e. a rapid change in non-native species), the vegetation aspects of the Ecological Site Descriptions are not as widely useful as the grant authors suggest. Despite their limitations, the ESDs will greatly increase the value of the digital soil maps and are still worth funding.
XGood	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

The goals, objectives and hypotheses are clearly stated. Overall, the proposed project is timely and important, but some aspects are more important and likely to contribute to the stated goals than other aspects.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

The study is well justified by the need for more complete soil and vegetation mapping for this region. The resulting maps will be useful data for a range of users with different goals, from basic ecological research to applied management plans. Since partial maps are not nearly as useful as the complete watershed and planning-area maps, and the methodologies are well established and consistent, it is appropriate to request a full-scale implementation of the project.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

The approach for this project is straight-forward, and requires no new or unusual methodologies. The digital soil-mapping portion of this project adds directly to our base of knowledge, and dissemination of this information with a web-based technology will make this information widely available to a range of possible users including decision-makers. Soil maps are very useful for scientists pursuing both basic and applied research, as well as public planning agencies, farmers and ranchers, and many other groups. The vegetation mapping portion of the project will also add new information to our knowledge base, and will pull together information from other sources and make this information more accessible. This will happen through summarizing the information into the Ecological Site Descriptions, and by making the information available via the web.

I have some concerns about the broad utility of the Ecological Site Descriptions and the format for the collection of new vegetation data, but it isn't clear whether the ESD format is flexible enough to address any of these concerns. My biggest concern is that the scale of resolution for soil types is generally larger than the scale of variation in plant communities, and this has been the case for my work in the north coast range of CA. Since vegetation can vary greatly within a soil type depending on small local changes in aspect, soil moisture, or site history, the average percent cover values given for an ESD are a simplification that may not be applicable for small local restoration efforts or some research projects. The percent cover values for different growth forms (e.g. 75% shrubs, 25% grass and forbs) without accompanying ranges or variances tends to give an overly confident picture of actual local vegetation types. Aggregate vegetation data at the scale of soil types is useful for regional planning and management efforts and for scientists who work at a landscape or watershed scale, but not particularly relevant for projects working at a scale of a tens of hectares or less (i.e. much basic science and many local community based projects). For addressing establishment of non-native species (goal 5), the Ecological Site Descriptions provide at best a snap-shot of a few areas within a soil type, and the example ESD in the grant contains almost no data on non-native species (a list of some observed species, without data on their abundance or recent history of spread). However, even data on current distributions of non-native species will likely be out of date within a few years, and yet to monitor and update changes in non-native species distributions would be the task of another large project. Again, the spatial scale of the Ecological Site Descriptions (equal to the spatial scale of soil type delineations) is not appropriate for some of the work on non-native species invasions that is needed. These concerns do not negate the usefulness of the ESDs, but I believe the grant authors are optimistic about the application of ESDs to some of their stated goals. If it were possible to break some of the largest soil units into multiple vegetation ESDs, that would partially address my concerns.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

I consider this project to have a very high probability of success. The methodologies for this project have a long history and are well worked out. The large scale of the project, the entire bay and delta regions, is necessary to accomplish aspects of the stated goals. Without complete soil and vegetation maps for each watershed area it will be difficult to create useful hydrologic management and recovery plans.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

I did not see specific performance measures, other than meeting the established quality guidelines for the soil and vegetation mapping protocols. There are clear time-lines with target dates for completion of each aspect of the project.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

The digital soil maps and ESDs that result from the project will be very useful, but I am not qualified to assess their value. Creation of a web-based venue for sharing the results of this project with interested public and private agencies is a good way to ensure maximum use of the data. I have some reservations about the value of the vegetation portion of the complete Ecological Site Descriptions, as expressed above.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

The organizations coordinating this proposal have a good track record and much background experience. They are well qualified to carry out their proposal, and have all necessary infrastructure.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The estimated costs for the project seem both reasonable and adequate.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **244**

Applicant Organization: **USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service**

Proposal Title: **Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

Some of the participants are located at my institution (UC-Davis)

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	Although the effort to provide digital maps that fully integrate soil and vegetation information is of obvious use for restoration and land management, it is not clear that this project will be able to meaningfully link the vegetation dynamics and soil data. In addition to the inherent limitation in the ESD approach, the scales of the soil and the vegetation data may not be compatible. In addition it is not clear to me that a current soil mapping project is even in the same region as this proposed work. If this current work is not in the same region then arguments by the applicant that this proposed project is a natural outgrowth of the current project is not correct.
-Good	
XPoor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

4 - Fair It is not clear how the ESD work and the currently funded soil survey work will be integrated. It would seem that the currently funded soil work is not in the same location (?). The description of the ESD themselves is very vague and I am unconvinced that the ESD concepts as actually practiced (trying to relate current composition to a hypothetical potential "climax" vegetation) are very helpful in predicting restoration success.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

4 - Fair Although it is clear that a better understanding of spatial dynamics in vegetation, this project does not clearly define the integration of soil and vegetation characteristics. I think it also overstates the capacity and predictive power of ESD as they are currently measured.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

4- Fair It is probably true that the acquisition of a digital soil and vegetation map would be value for some planning aspects. Unfortunately, however, it does not appear that much thought has been given to the concrete linkage of soil data and vegetation data. It would seem that the scales of soil vs. vegetation change are often not the same but the applicants to not address this significant problem. At the temporal scale there are also problems because ESD are unfortunately fairly static entities (i.e. usually plant composition is measured once) and do not take into account significant variation in composition over time. In other words, the dynamics of the local vegetation is not encapsulated.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

3 - Good It is likely that the ESD portion of the project would be completed but it is much less clear that an effective integration of soil data and ESD would be accomplished.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

3 - Good The performance measures are primarily related to the task timeline presented.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

3 - Good The development of the digital soil and vegetation maps would be of use for some management questions although I am not sure if they would be that useful for guiding or predicting restoration projects beyond what information is already available. The web-based dissemination of the information should greatly increase its value.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

2 - Very Good

The applicants have the infrastructure and the experience to complete the tasks outlined.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

3 - Good Although the budget appears to be appropriate, the massive (although recognized) mistake in the budget spreadsheet is a bit disquieting.

Miscellaneous comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 244

New Proposal Title: Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

Current project is an interagency contract to provide services to support Water Use Efficiency implementation at the farm level.

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

None

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

-Yes ☒No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

Have not been getting progress reports per contract.

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

-Yes ☒No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

This contractor is having trouble doing the work assigned. Staff funded with this contract seem to be doing other tasks related to existing agency goals & programs.

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

This agency has a history of using grant funding to support existing programs - rather than fulfilling the terms of the grant.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 244

New Proposal Title: Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

ERP 01-N30 - Digital Soil Survey Mapping and Digital Orthophotoquad Imagery Development

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

N/A

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

N/A

Other Comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 244

New Proposal Title: Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

99-R01 Acquisition of Floodplain Easements - Lower Tuolumne River and San Joaquin River

00-R01 Sacramento River Small Diversion Fish Screen Program

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

Standard terms were negotiated for NRCS that should continue to work in the future.

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

none

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 244

Applicant Organization: USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

Proposal Title: Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

If collecting native plants, will need a Scientific Collecting Permit.

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

N/A

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 244

Applicant Organization: USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

Proposal Title: Development of Ecological Site Descriptions as Integral Components of Digital Soil Survey Information and Predictors of Success of Habitat Restoration

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

Administrative Expense components not provided. Additional surcharge of \$10K/person/year noted.

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

Applicant notes that budget tables are not computing correctly.

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: